

REMARKS

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claim 9 was objected to because the word "each" had not been inserted after the word --teeth--. Claim 9 has been cancelled and new claim 10 contains the word -each- after the word "teeth.

On paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Reconsideration is requested.

As noted *supra*, Claim 9 has been cancelled and new claim 10 has been added to point out the Applicant's invention in order to distinguish the claimed invention from the Genter et al. patent.

The term "flank" has been replaced by the more appropriate term "side". The term "side" is used to describe the lateral part of the tooth that extends from the tooth root to the top of the tooth.

New claim 10 also points out the further feature of Applicant's gear that the composite gear is formed by inserting the bottom gear into the top gear. The claimed assembly points out that the teeth of the first gear portion and the second gear portion would have the same height.

The text of claim 10 points out a gear wheel construction that is novel and non-obvious with respect to the cited prior art patent.

In the composite gear disclosed by Genter et al., the gear portion is not inserted into one another, but is arranged to place the gear portion one above the other. Thus, contrary the assertion of the Examiner, Genter et al.


only discloses the second gear wheel portion as being "clearly coupled about" the first gear wheel portion.

In this connection, Applicant desires to draw the attention of the Examiner to the fact that in Genter et al. the two gear portions have teeth of different heights. Accordingly, even if the first gear portion would be introduced into the second gear portion, it would not provide an operable gear wheel because the teeth taught by the prior art patent have different heights. In addition, the gear wheel portions taught by the prior art patent also have like diameters. In Applicant's claimed composite gear wheel, to insert one gear portion into the other, it should be self evident that the two gear portions would have different diameters. In other words, the prior art patent fails to provide any useful teachings for constructing a gear wheel having the features of the gear wheel pointed out in new claim 10.

Accordingly, allowance of this new claim 10 is strongly urged.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


James V. Costigan
Registration No. 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS

HEDMAN & COSTIGAN, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this
correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service as
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 11/06/03

